REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-24 were pending in the application. Upon entry of this Response, claims 1 and 4-29 will be in this application, claims 25-29 having been added in this paper.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1 and 4-24 are rejected as being anticipated by Pizano et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,293,429 ("Pizano").

Before discussing specific claim language now included in claim 1, applicants will first note that the term "template", although common to the present application and to the Pizano reference, effectively has different meanings as used therein. In Pizano, a "template" is used during automated pattern recognition to classify a digitized image of a business form. Contrariwise, in the present application, "template" refers to a form to be filled out by a user (see, e.g., FIG. 9 of the present patent application), and which directs the user to enter particular types of data to create a new document record (see page 23, lines 18-21 of the substitute specification filed on October 25, 2001).

Considering then claim 1, as now presented, the following is recited in claim 1: "A data storage method" which includes "identifying a template based on a classification of a document to be stored". It is further recited in claim 1 that the template "direct[s] a user to enter data". Claim 1 further recites "receiving document information associated with said document" and that "said document information include[es] said data entered by said user" Also recited in claim 1 are "generating a pending record containing said document information", "verifying said document information" and "generating an active record if said verifying is successful". Finally, claim 1 recites that "said active record [is] available for searching and retrieval by a user".

It is noted that claim 1 has now been amended to specify that the "template" recited therein directs a user to enter data which is included in document data associated with the document to be stored. Support for this amendment is found at least at the above-referenced passage at page 23, lines 18-21 of the substitute specification. With this amendment, the "template" recited in claim 1 is now clearly distinguished from the template described in the Pizano reference. Pizano's template is used for automated pattern matching to identify business

forms, and does not direct a user to enter data, as now recited in claim 1. Accordingly, at least as now amended, claim 1 is believed to be clearly patentably distinguished from the Pizano reference.

Claims 4-16 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1 and are submitted as patentable on the same basis as claim 1.

In addition, at least claims 6, 10, 12, 15 and 16 are believed to support grounds of patentability in addition to the grounds pointed out above in connection with claim 1.

Regarding claim 6, which recites the additional limitation of "determining if said document has previously been stored", that limitation is not taught by the reference. The reference discloses determining whether a form is matched or not against a library of templates, but does not determine whether a document has previously been stored.

Claim 10 recites "referencing a document record identifier" in both a pending record and in an image of a document, as part of associating the pending record with the document. The reference makes no mention of a document record identifier.

Claim 12 recites that the document information includes at least one of "a collection name; a file name; subcategory information; location information; owner information; creator information; cross reference information; status information; history information; geographical information; and archive information". None of these types of document information is disclosed in the reference.

Claim 15 recites limiting access to pending records to authorized reviewers. This limitation also is not present in the reference.

Claim 16 recites "receiving document information from an external system used to generate said document" as part of receiving document information. The reference makes no mention of such an external system used to generate a document.

Claim 17 is the next independent claim. Like claim 1, claim 17 has been amended to specify that the "template" recited therein "direct[s] a user to enter data". Accordingly, claim 17 is believed to be patentable on the same basis as claim 1. Claims 18-20, being directly or indirectly dependent on claim 17, are submitted as patentable on the same basis as claim 17.

Claim 21, as now presented, is directed to a "document retrieval method" which includes "receiving information associated with a desired document" and "identifying an active record of a document management database containing said information". Claim 21 further recites that "said active record includ[es] information having previously been approved and converted from a pending record". In addition, the method of claim 21 includes "identifying a physical location at which said document is located", "displaying information from said record" and "identifying a location of an image of said document".

Claim 21 has been clarifyingly amended to recite "identifying a physical location <u>at which said document is located</u>" but is otherwise unchanged. It is noted that the Pizano reference does not in any way disclose identifying a physical location at which a document is located. Rather, Pizano is concerned only with classifying digitized images of business forms. The physical location of a document is not an issue in the system disclosed in Pizano. It is accordingly submitted that claim 21 is patentable over the reference.

Claims 22-24 are independent claims that have been amended in substantially the same manner as claim 1 and that are believed to be patentable over Pizano for the same reasons given above in regard to claim 1.

Claims 25-29 are new claims that are respectively dependent on claims 1, 17 and 22-24. Thus these new claims are believed patentable on the same basis as their parent claims. Furthermore, each of the new claims recites, in substance, displaying a template to a user. Support for this limitation is found at page 23, lines 17-21 of the substitute specification.

Noting once more that the "template" recited in the claims is different from the template discussed in the Pizano reference, applicants also observe that Pizano makes no disclosure of displaying the template discussed therein. Accordingly, claims 25-29 are believed to support an additional ground of patentability beyond that discussed in regard to the parent claims 1, 17 and 22-24.

Conclusion

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the

9

present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,

March 9, 2004
Date

Nathaniel Levin
Registration No. 34,860
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Five Elm Street
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-3460